THE

MONTHLY JOURNAL.

VOL. IV.] BOSTON, DECEMBER, 1863. [No. 12.

ESSAY ON THE SIN AGAINST THE HOLY GHOST.

BY JAMES FREEMAN CLARKE.

THE passage in which the sin against the Holy Ghost is spoken of is Matt. xii. 31, 32; and is as follows:—

"Wherefore I say unto you, All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men; but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost" (or rather the blasphemy of the Spirit) "shall not be forgiven unto men. And, whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him; but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, nor in the world to come."

The sin here spoken of is commonly called the Unpardonable Sin. The corresponding passage is in Mark iii. 28, 29; and in Luke xii. 10.

There has been much investigation as to the nature of this sin against the Holy Ghost. I think that the majority of Christians have no distinct idea what it means. Many are troubled for fear lest they should ignorantly commit it. Many are rendered miserable, thinking that they have com-

mitted it. Some people suppose that it is possible to commit this sin ignorantly, and almost accidently. Some think that it is an exceptional and peculiar sin, having no parallel, belonging to no class, standing quite alone. It is thought not possible to explain its nature, or give a reason for its fatal penalty: hence it is made an arbitrary act of God. God is thought to have made this sin worse than others in its nature and penalty for good reasons of his own, of which we can know nothing. Now, all this partakes of the nature of superstition, and therefore is very injurious. Superstitious fears do us no good, — only harm. The only fear which does us good is rational fear. Midnight, ghostly, spectral fears do no one any good. It is the mid-day fear of what we see, and comprehend to be evil, which helps us; and no other kind of fear. Let us see, then, if we can throw a little of the daylight of reason and common sense on this subject.

First, then, as to the opinion that this is a sin which may be committed ignorantly and accidentally.

If any one should leave a deep but concealed hole in a place where people were walking to and fro, so that, without knowing it, they might suddenly fall in, and be killed, we should think him a bad man. We should say, "If he cannot cover up the hole, he can at least put a distinct mark over it, so that all may know where it is, and be able to avoid it." But what shall we say of those who think that God has left a concealed place, through which men may fall, in a moment, not into temporal, but eternal death? It is a dreadful thing to believe concerning the Almighty Father. I, for one, will never believe it.

It may be that the meaning is simpler than we suppose, and that there may be a significance which we can comprehend, and make use of. The best way to understand it is to read the whole passage, and find when it was said, and why it was said.

It was said to the Pharisees; and it was said to them because they attributed the good works of Christ to an evil power. He healed a man who was both blind and dumb. They said, "He casts out devils by Beelzebub, prince of the devils." Jesus said that this was not blasphemy against *him*, but against *the Spirit of God.* Why so? The Holy Ghost had not been mentioned: the Pharisees had said nothing about the Holy Ghost; but they had attributed his good actions to an evil power. How did that blaspheme the Holy Ghost? The blasphemy was not in words, but in the meaning of their words. It is the Holy Ghost, or Spirit of God, which teaches us what goodness is. Now, in denying that the action of Jesus had a good source, they denied, virtually, that it was a good action; for the Devil does not do good actions: if he did, he would not be the Devil. Good actions must come from God, from whom cometh down every good and every perfect gift. We must either make the tree good and the fruit good, or else we must make the tree corrupt and the fruit corrupt. Therefore, in saying that Christ cast out demons by Beelzebub, they said that casting out demons was not a good, but a bad action. Now, they knew better than that. God's spirit, in their heart, taught them, that to cast out demons was not a bad action, but a good one. The blasphemy against the Holy Ghost consisted, therefore, in denying that goodness was good. For the sake of putting down Jesus, they contradicted the most fundamental convictions of their own hearts.

According to this, to say that a thing comes of evil, which our moral instincts and spiritual intuitions teach us to be good, is to blaspheme the Holy Ghost.

There are certain fundamental moral convictions, which God bestows upon us at the beginning, which are the foundations of all other convictions. These are primitive; all

others are derivative: these are certain, other things probable. Doubt or deny these, and the whole fabric of knowledge, faith, belief, opinion, totters. If you are not sure of your intuitions, you are uncertain of every thing. But this is not the worst; for not only does all knowledge, but also all goodness, rest on this foundation. Deny your moral convictions, and there is no right or wrong, no good or evil, no duty, no God.

Since these fundamental convictions are so important, God has rooted them in the soul, so that we cannot escape from them: they are there when we deny their existence. We cannot believe that goodness is not good: but we can say that it is not good; and to speak thus against our own highest convictions is to blaspheme the Holy Ghost. This is just what the Pharisees did, and this is the essence of the unpardonable blasphemy.

Some commentators have narrowed down the meaning of the sin, in order to show that we are not in danger of committing it now. To relieve anxious minds, they say that it is only doing what the Pharisees did at that time; viz., ascribing Christ's miraculous acts of healing to the Devil: so, as no one now-a-days does this, no one now is in any danger of committing this sin. Now, this explanation will, no doubt, relieve the anxious minds who believe it, but at the expense of reducing the doctrine to a nullity. It also leaves an unreasonable character attaching to the words of Jesus, and does not explain his purpose in such a declaration.

The sin against the Holy Ghost is, in our opinion, not a single outward action, but conduct and words proceeding from a fixed inward state. It is a determination of the mind not to receive what is seen to be truth, and not to accept what is known to be good, because this truth and this goodness conflict with its own prejudices, interests, or

desires. It is the mind hardening itself against goodness, sophisticating itself against right. It is essentially a state of mind.

Nor is this sin, therefore, an unconscious act, done ignorantly. Men sometimes fear that they may ignorantly, and without knowing it, have committed the unpardonable sin; but this is not possible. Whatever we do ignorantly and unconsciously may be pardoned. "I obtained mercy," says the apostle, "because I did it ignorantly, in unbelief." "Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do." No one need ever fear that he has committed the unpardonable sin without knowing it.

Nor is this an isolated and exceptional doctrine, standing alone, and unconnected with the other teachings of Jesus. This is the only place that it is called by this name as blasphemy against the Holy Ghost; but the same doctrine is implied everywhere else. The whole gospel of Christ, in all its teachings, is based upon the idea, that man can be helped by God and by his brother-man out of all evil states but one. So long as he does not wilfully resist God's truth and love, he can be forgiven and sanctified: but he cannot be forgiven against his will; he cannot be saved against his will; he cannot go to heaven against his will. This state of mind, whether it shows itself in blasphemy against the Spirit of Goodness, in a heart hardened against right, a conscience seared as with a hot iron, or in acts of resistance to the cause of right, is always the same.

Thus far we have reasoned from the context, from the words of Scripture here: now let us reason from the analogy of faith. Scripture is a unit: at all events, the gospel is a unit; it cannot contradict itself. The doctrine, therefore, which is taught obscurely here, is, I believe, taught very plainly elsewhere.

The danger of committing the sin against the Holy

Ghost is the great penalty of abused freedom. God has determined that man shall be free. He has not made man for simple happiness; for such enjoyment as he gives to the fish in water, or the bird in air: he has made him for the higher happiness which comes from goodness. He shall not be happy at all, he shall be gnawed inwardly by a divine unrest, he shall be inwardly dissatisfied, till he can be satisfied through truth and right. Nor does God intend that he shall become good till he can become so freely. There was a Holy of Holies in the Jewish temple, into which no one went but the high priest, and he only once a year. In the centre of the human soul, there is a Holy of Holies, — the sacred seat of personality, the private place of human freedom, which only the individual himself can enter. The key of that door, God has given to him alone. Even God will not enter it against his will. He can shut out God and man; he can shut out truth and goodness. That he may be wholly free, the power is given him of believing falsehood, and loving evil. From that centre of the soul, every thing which proceeds is free. If goodness comes from it, it is the man's own; if evil, that is also his own. But the great power carries with it a great danger. If we retire into the citadel of our soul when we are resisting truth, no power, divine or human, can follow us in to change us or to help us.

This, then, it is to sin against the Holy Ghost. It is to shut out truth, to resist good, to harden the conscience against the Spirit of God; and the punishment is what the Saviour announces: "This is the condemnation" (or "damnation;" for it is the same word which is elsewhere translated "damnation"), — "this is the damnation, that light has come into the world, and that men have loved darkness rather than light." The punishment for resisting light is, that we remain in darkness: that is punishment

enough. Eternal damnation, or spiritual damnation, as opposed to temporal damnation, is absence from the truth and love of God: it is the absence from God's presence. He who shuts out God is away from God, — that is all; but that is enough. And as forgiveness means, in the New Testament, God coming into the soul with a sense of his love, those who shut him out cannot be forgiven, because he will not enter their soul against their will.

We may now see what is meant when it is said that blasphemy against the Holy Ghost cannot be forgiven in this world or that which is to come. It means, that, in this and in every other world, God will leave us free, — free to accept, free to resist, his truth and his goodness. When we knowingly and wilfully resist goodness, he allows us to do so, and to take the consequences.

"In this world, or in that which is to come." The literal meaning here is, "*in this present age, and in the coming age;*" i. e., of the Messiah. The present age was the age of the Law: the coming age would be the age of the Gospel. Now, the people thought, and thought truly, that, in the age of the Messiah, many sins would be forgiven which were not forgiven then. The coming of Christ was to be a new coming of God's forgiving love, — "God in Christ, reconciling the world to himself." The prophets foretold, that, in the time of the Messiah, God would forgive their sins. "In those days, saith the Lord, I will forgive your iniquity, and I will remember your sin no more." The law of Moses said, "*Do* this, and thou shalt live:" Christ said, "*Believe* in God's forgiveness, and be forgiven." The domain of forgiveness is, therefore, much wider under the Gospel than it was under the Law. There is no parable of the Prodigal Son in the Old Testament. Neither Moses nor Elijah ever said, "Be of good cheer: thy sins are forgiven thee." God is always the same; but

his revelations are different and progressive. Christ revealed the forgiving love of God as it had not been revealed before; and he revealed it, not by word only, but by action. He communicated forgiveness: he had power on earth to forgive sin.

But there was one sin which even he could not forgive; and that was the sin of a heart deliberately shutting itself up, in its citadel of freedom, against God's revelation of love. Not in this age, nor in the age to come, — not in any age, any place, any time, — can this sin be forgiven. The conditions of forgiveness are wanting, — humility, penitence, a desire to be forgiven.

For again we ask, What is forgiveness? We know what is meant by human forgiveness. Man forgives when he ceases to be angry, and ceases to punish: but God cannot forgive in either of these ways; he can neither cease to be angry, nor cease to punish. He cannot cease to be angry; for he never is angry as man is angry. His anger is infinite indignation against sin, joined to an infinite pity for the sinner: he can never cease from either. Nor can God cease to punish sin as long as sin continues; for his punishments are blessings: they are what we need; they are for our good; they are the established consequences of faults; they came by laws which can never be broken. To suffer while we sin is the best thing which can befall us. God, therefore, never forgives by remitting penalty. How, then, does he forgive?

God's forgiveness is reaching out and finding the sinner, and drawing him to himself. It is loving us while we sin, and making us feel his love. It is removing the alienation which sin always causes; for, whenever we do wrong, we turn away from God. It is God's love, coming to find us, and to reconcile us to himself, which constitutes forgiveness. God does not forgive us because we have

repented, but to lead us to repentance. We must, indeed, have the beginnings of repentance, the sense of the evil of our sin, and the feeling of emptiness and want while away from God. Then he comes, reconciling us to himself. He sends some sweet influence into the soul; he draws our heart toward him; he awakens the conviction of his nearness; he brings a sense of re-union; he enables us again to say, "My Father!" This is God's forgiveness; and it is what Christ came to reveal and to impart.

All manner of sin and blasphemy, therefore, Christ could forgive. He could forgive the thief on the cross, the woman taken in adultery, the other sinner who brought her box of ointment, Peter who denied him thrice, Pilate who condemned him, the soldiers who crucified him, Paul who persecuted him. He could forgive these; for he saw in them all, either penitence, capacity for penitence, honest error, or ignorant unbelief. But, in the heart of the Pharisee, he saw neither humility nor ignorance, but a determined purpose not to submit to the truth; and he *could not* forgive them: *they* had made it impossible.

"Whoever shall blaspheme the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him." The Apostle Paul was a remarkable instance of this. He had blasphemed the Son of man; he had persecuted and abused those who believed in him. "And yet," said he, "I obtained mercy, because I did it ignorantly, in unbelief;" and he obtained mercy, not after he had repented, but in the very act of going on with his persecutions. Christ saw in his heart an ignorant honesty, capable of becoming penitence when more light should come. It was not his repentance which led to his being forgiven; but he was forgiven that he might repent. "The goodness of God leads us to repentance," said he afterward. And so, ever since, it has happened that infidels and deists have been converted in the midst of their blasphemies, and

changed into friends of Christ: their hearts were not as bad as their heads.

When, therefore, men commit sin from ignorance or from passion, God's mercy may come to them at any time to humble them and to bring them to repentance; but those who harden their heart against the truth make themselves incapable of this divine mercy, and, as we read in the parallel passage, "are in danger of eternal damnation."

What is this eternal damnation? According to the common idea, it is an everlasting outward hell, from which one cannot escape. The word, however, signifies simply "judgment," as it is translated in almost every instance; or, as we have seen above, it may mean "condemnation," as it is translated in John: "This is the condemnation, that light has come into the world; but that men chose darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil."

According to this text, the damnation, or judgment, of those who blaspheme the Holy Ghost is in the fact that they choose darkness rather than light. So, likewise, we are told of those who shall go away into outer darkness. They choose to go away from Christ, and therefore go into darkness, loneliness, and spiritual death. They are not driven; they go.

Does this passage teach the common doctrine of everlasting punishment in the future life for sins committed in the present world? Olshausen is inclined to think that it does; though he says, "The statement that there is one sin which cannot be forgiven in the world to come allows us to conclude, that all other sins can be forgiven in the world to come." But, according to the explanation just given, though it teaches eternal punishment (like the whole of the New Testament), it does not teach that this is the same as never-ending punishment. Eternal punishment is the punishment of eternity, as distinguished from

the punishments of time. It comes from within, and not from without; from the sight of eternal truth, and not from temporal changes.

Close observers of the language of the New Testament must have noticed this phrase, "are *in danger* of eternal damnation." How *in danger* of it? We should say, according to common Orthodox ideas, that those who could not be forgiven in this world, or that which is to come, were not only "in danger" of eternal damnation, but were at least certain of it, if not already damned. Poor Cowper believed himself eternally damned already for having sinned against the Holy Ghost. But Christ does not say this: he says they are "*in danger* of eternal damnation."

The explanation is, that this sin is not a single act, but a state of mind, having degrees. We *gradually* harden ourselves against any truth; and are in danger of hardening ourselves so completely, that it will become impossible for us to see it. We at last find ourselves in a condition in which the soul is wholly directed to something foreign from God and his will. God is totally shut out, and we are contented and self-satisfied in being away from him. This is eternal or spiritual death, as distinguished from all temporal loss, pain, and evil.

Now, when one has reached this point, and has shut God out by hardening the heart against his truth, what remains for them? Nothing but to go on, and to see his evil out; to carry it out to its last results; and so by the road, not of forgiveness, but of utter evil, to reach good and truth again. When, how, where, no one can say; for no one can sound the mysteries of free-will. When one has wholly set his will to oppose truth, how far and how long he may go in that direction, no one can say. He must go through with it, and see it to the end.

We said above, that God could not forgive by remitting

the natural consequences of evil; for this natural penalty is what is best for the offender himself. Perhaps we went too far in saying this. God may sometimes forgive, even in this sense, those who have not committed the unpardonable sin. The natural consequence of opposing Christ is to be without Christ; but, in the case of Paul, God remitted this penalty, and brought him to know and love Jesus by a special act of mercy. He often forgives us all in like ways, and remits by special favor the natural penalties of our sins. The natural consequence of selfishness is, not to be loved; but how many selfish persons are forgiven the full measure of this penalty, and continue to be loved by affectionate wives and children! Therefore it is true, even in this sense, that all manner of sins and offences may be forgiven, except this one of hardening the heart against the truth by a wilful resistance.

Those who are most likely to commit the unpardonable sin are not atheists, deists, heretics, profane persons, sabbath-breakers, drunkards, thieves; but, on the other hand, bigots and sectarians, who think themselves the only orthodox and religious characters extant.

Nothing hardens the heart so much against the Holy Spirit as dogmatic or ecclesiastic bigotry. There are those to whom goodness is not good, if out of their own sect; to whom love and generosity go for nothing in a heathen or a heretic; who call the most noble virtues "mere morality," if not attended by the technical tests of conversion received in their own puny party. The better a man is, the worse he is in their esteem, if he denies their creed. When they see the demons of pride, lust, selfishness, cast out of the soul by the power of conscience, charity, purity, and faith, they say, virtually, that this is done by the power of Satan. We have even heard it stated in terms by a champion of Orthodoxy, that heretics are apt to be better men than the

Orthodox, because the Devil uses their goodness as a bait to allure men into their heresies. This, and the like declarations, come as near to the precise sin against the Holy Ghost, which Jesus rebuked, as can well be.

I once had this conversation with a young lady, who had recently joined the Catholic Church: —

"You say, that, out of the Church, there is no salvation. What do you do, then, with all the good Protestants you have known, — your own father and mother for example, — or Dr. Channing and Henry Ware, and such persons?"

"Oh! we allow for those who are in invincible ignorance. They, though out of the Church, may yet be saved."

"True; but such men as I have named had ample opportunity to investigate the claims of the Roman-Catholic Church, and yet rejected it. They were not in any invincible ignorance. They, therefore, must be damned: must they not?"

"I admit it: they must."

"Then God damns good people; does he?"

"But the goodness of those not in the Church only seems to be goodness. It is not really goodness unless it comes from the true Church."

"Very well. This is the point to which I wished to bring you. We cannot know goodness when we see it: that is the logical result of your Catholic doctrine. This is striking at the foundation of all faith. We believe in God as the infinitely good Being; but we must know goodness first, in order to believe that God is good. We believe in Christ because of the goodness of his life, his word, his works, his gospel; but we must know goodness first, in order to believe that Christ and his religion are good. But, according to your Catholic principle, we cannot tell goodness when we see it; consequently, we cannot have

any ground for belief in God or Christ; still less, therefore, in the Church founded by Christ: so that your principle legitimates atheism and deism, and overthrows your own Church into the bargain."

Most churches reverse this teaching of Jesus, and teach the precise opposite. Those who blaspheme the Holy Spirit may be forgiven, but not those who say a word against the Son. They see all generous and noble actions done; and, because not done by the "evangelical" sects, they deny them to be the work of God. The goodness of heretics, of the heathen, of deists, of atheists, has nothing divine in it to them: it is a mere trick of the Devil to deceive souls. People may thus reject and blaspheme the Holy Spirit, and it will be forgiven them; but, if they deny the deity or atonement of Christ, it cannot be forgiven them. So the Church curses him whom Christ has blessed, and absolves him whom Christ has condemned.

The result of this investigation, then, has brought us to these results: —

1. The sin against the Holy Ghost is denying the divine character of goodness, and resisting the power of truth and love, in order to maintain some private conviction, purpose, or prejudice. It is simply resisting good by the force of the will.

2. This sin against the Holy Ghost, therefore, is not a singular or exceptional act, but is frequent and very common in all men, but especially common among the religious, and in those who lay the greatest stress on their having the true faith or the true Church.

3. It is a sin which cannot be forgiven, because it closes the mind against the very truth which would bring repentance, and make forgiveness possible.

4. It is a sin, therefore, which must be expiated by suffering, and which can only find its solution by being

carried out to its last result, producing its full fruits, and showing itself so conclusively to be evil as to make further persistence in it at last impossible.

5. Finally, there are these two classes of sins, — venial and unpardonable. The first are committed by those who love truth and goodness, but fail through ignorance, weakness, force of habit, bad example, &c. The second are wilful sins, — sins committed against the truth. The first may be *pardoned;* that is, their evil consequences removed by the mercy of God. The second must be expiated; that is, their evil consequences must be borne, even to the end. Of these it may be said, "Verily thou shalt not come out till thou hast paid the uttermost farthing."

THINGS IN MADRAS.

[The following letter from Mr. Dall, dated July 28, shows the result of the efforts, thus far, in behalf of William Roberts.]

MADRAS, July 28, 1863.

TO EDITOR "MONTHLY JOURNAL."

DEAR BROTHER CLARKE, — Your "Monthly Journal" for May last gave very generously of its space to Madras. William Roberts has lent me the number; and I see that Bro. Winkley's appeal sits there side by side with my own. We both pleaded for the upholding of the brave little church which has held its place here on and on to this *fiftieth* year of the brick-chapel dedication, — the Roberts Chapel. The wonder is, that this should have been accomplished mainly by the energy of born Hindoos, — men least of all developed in the element of force and will; men who, in this case, have received more, far more, of the head-shake than of the nod from "us that are strong in the West."

By the way, do you know of any set of "Anglo-Saxon" Unitarians who have kept up their numbers and their schools and their courage and their public worship for fifty years, wholly on "lay" services, as these poor "willless" ones have done? Bro. Winkley says, in closing his appeal, "Though nothing more be ever done for India missions, self-respect demands of American Unitarians to see to it that that chapel be repaired, and kept so; and that William Roberts be taken from his present damp hut, and finish his days in that redeemed parsonage. . . . Shall it be done, and that speedily?" . . . Generous hearts in your part of the world may have been touched by this appeal, and such will be glad to know that a practical answer is being made to this reasonable call. You may remember, that, before leaving Boston, friends had put into my hands, for Madras, — chiefly of Dr. Gannett's Society, and at the farewell meeting, — contributions that realized sixty-six pounds, or sovereigns, in gold. Well, I found, on arriving here, that it would be every way cheaper and better to have a *new* parsonage and schoolhouse, both in one, on ground over against the chapel, than to have a fight at law for the old and half-ruined building that had been left to the church for a pastor's home, but which had been seized and sold, and lately sold again. To carry out this idea, I have obtained full ownership of that lot for a school and parsonage; and, in accomplishing this, have parted with but twenty-seven of my sovereigns. Thirty-nine remain; and, of these, I gave the whole (adding a few of my own) to put the chapel in thorough repair. Three different parties have sent in their estimates for these necessary repairs; and they vary from three hundred and fifty to five hundred and fifty rupees. My plan is to deposit in the bank four hundred rupees, and to hold William Roberts singly responsible for their wise

and economical application, as advised by a committee of three of his best men, — David Chourimootro, Samuel Cholay, and John Domingo. This, with what the congregation themselves mean to raise for the purpose, — perhaps thirty or forty rupees, — will "see to it that that chapel is repaired." Giving William Roberts a better home is a third point with Bro. Winkley and the rest of us who care for the permanency of the first Christian Unitarian *Church* in India.

On reaching Madras, I found William Roberts and his family had removed from their Royapettah Cabin, which they have repaired, and hope to rent. They were and are residing in Triplicane (another ward of the city), close under the windows of one of the city "palaces," — the Ice House. Mr. Bancroft, an American gentleman, who has resided here and known William Roberts for a dozen years, had, I found, given him a responsible position in the Ice House, to be held during his own absence of a year or two in Massachusetts: another testimony to William's fidelity. Since Mr. Bancroft left, William has been drawing a salary large for him, — *i.e.*, seventy-five rupees a month; and this, I hope, is to continue for at least a year or two. After repeated charges to that effect, William Roberts had reluctantly closed the schools of his mission some four or five months ago. Forty pounds arrived from London; and, what with this and his own seven pound ten per month, the old strongholds of debt have begun to tumble down. His own debt for food is reduced to about four hundred rupees; and he is working his best to bring all things to a creditable balance, — among other things, paying two rupees a month towards a clearance of old arrearages for rent of schoolrooms; a bill within fifty rupees for rooms (if they could be honored with that

designation), the regular charge for which was one rupee four annas a month, or about sixty-two and a half cents.

On the 15th of the present month, I opened again, at my own risk and charges, the best of the Roberts schools; and am glad to find already about thirty boys in attendance, — most of the pupils not only barefooted, but bare altogether. Most of them will pay a few cents a month: but, if there be such a thing as a charity-school, this is one; yet several of the boys wrote for me with their fingers, in the sand on the floor on which they sat, with a grace, and mastery of form, that surprised me. I have induced two English Unitarian gentlemen here to give the sixteen rupees which has placed a good clock on the walls of the chapel. Another English Unitarian resident of Madras has subscribed two rupees a month towards the seven rupees a month that I am to pay my schoolmaster David, who is a good man of fifty, and was trained up for a school-teacher by William Roberts, sen. I have left no room here to tell of my late interesting meetings for social worship, the christening of children, &c., held at Tripatoor (a new opening) and at Salem (two hundred miles from this), where Lorenzo, one of the church there, has given land, which he showed me, for a chapel, to serve also as a school-house and reading-room. I spent three days among the Unitarian Christians of Salem (all *natives*); and we had three prayer-meetings, with two sermons. William Roberts could not be spared from the Ice House to travel with us: so I took his son Samuel, a good, bright, well-disposed young man of seventeen; and it gave me joy to see how quietly and successfully he led off in the Tamul portions of our services, at Salem and Tripatoor, in the chants, Bible-readings, responses, &c.;

and also fulfilled to me the duty of a clear-spoken and ready interpreter. God grant he be a good pastor some day, a colleague to his father, and a gospel teacher, abler than he, because better trained! As deeds are better than words, — words even in the form of prayer, — I have resolved to take Samuel with me to Calcutta, and do what I can to make him a good minister of Jesus Christ. With tears, yet cheerfully, his mother consents to this "for his grandfather's sake." How many boys have you in your Sunday school who could lead a prayer-meeting of twenty-five people? Samuel Roberts conducted one meeting after I had left the place.

Your Brother Dall.

MR. SAWYER AND THE CHRISTIAN INTELLIGENCER.

No doubt, the editors of periodicals, being infallible judges of every thing, even of the books they have not had time to read, have a perfect right to criticise and condemn the works, the published opinions, and the writings of men infinitely superior to themselves. Any modesty on their part is quite out of place. A man gives twenty laborious years to writing a book. The critic, who never spent an hour in studying the subject, and has only an hour in which to read and review the volumes, turns over the leaves, half a dozen at a time, and pronounces the book empty and false, or wise and good, according as it came from his side, or from the side opposed to him. In a political editor, we

expect nothing better: perhaps, in the editor of a religious magazine or newspaper, we ought.

But this is not the question we now have to touch. Editors may with impunity rend, ravage, and devour all the best books in the land. They are in their right in doing so. Authors are a people to be scattered and peeled, to be trampled under foot of men, to be snubbed and worried, *ad libitum*. They know it when they write, and are prepared for it.

Hitherto, however, it has not been considered the thing for an editor to go too far in abusing an author. Rend the book, but let alone the writer. You may say that the book is stupid and false; but you cannot call the author a thief and a liar, without exposing yourself to a suit for libel. Such, at least, has been the law for secular editors; and, having it, they usually keep a civil pen directed to the author, while they lacerate the author's work *ad libitum*.

But religious editors have commonly held themselves exempt from such limitations. Being religious editors, they claim the benefit of clergy, and call their neighbors any hard names they will, with impunity. But Mr. Sawyer, it seems, does not quite approve of this practice, and has tested the opinions of the courts in regard to it; thereby putting the said courts quite in a flutter, and disturbing their legal equanimity not a little. Also he has caused an equal consternation among "religious" editors. "What!" they say, "must not we call a writer, from whom we differ, an infidel, a heretic, an ass, a lunatic, a renegade, a liar, a blackguard?" They feel as the slaveholders in New Orleans felt when told by Gen. Butler that they must not "wallop their niggers" any more. But let us describe the case.

From the Utica (N. Y.) Morning "Herald" of Oct. 23.

THEOLOGY IN COURT. — INTERESTING CASE.

REV. LEICESTER AMBROSE SAWYER *versus* THE CHRISTIAN INTELLIGENCER. — At the Circuit Court still in session in this city, the case of Leicester Ambrose Sawyer *versus* Charles van Wyck was called on yesterday morning. The plaintiff is the well-known author of a new translation of the New Testament, and other scriptural translations and theological works of doubtful orthodoxy. The defendant is the publisher of the "Christian Intelligencer," a New-York paper devoted to the interests of the Reform Protestant Dutch denomination. The plaintiff charges the defendant with publishing in his paper libellous words, in a notice of his book entitled "Reconstruction of Biblical Theories, or Biblical Science Improved," and claims damages amounting to $10,000. The counsel appearing for the plaintiff was Le Grand Marvin of Buffalo; for the defendant, Henry A. Foster of Rome, and William H. Waring of New York. Several of the leading clergymen of the city had been summoned as witnesses, and were present during the day. The alleged libellous notice in question called the contents of the book "balderdash" and "twaddle;" and had the following sentence, on which the prosecution was chiefly based: —

"On looking over it (the book), we first supposed it to have been written by a lunatic; but recollecting that its author was first a renegade Unitarian from Congregationalism, and then a renegade infidel from Unitarianism, we suspected the existence of a method in his madness."

Mr. Sawyer was the first witness called, and was questioned as to his books, especially his book on the "Reconstruction of Bible Theories," its circulation, his contract with its publishers, &c.; also as to his past and present religious and denominational associations. In the course of the cross-examination, Mr. Foster proposed to show that Mr. Sawyer was a "renegade infidel." Judge Morgan inquired what an infidel was; and Mr. Foster replied, that he was a person who did not believe in the authenticity of the Scriptures. The judge thought the term

indefinite. Every man in this free country has a right to his opinions on the subject, and opinions were various. The jury were the proper persons to decide in the case as to the meaning of the terms. He would therefore allow evidence to show what Mr. Sawyer's sentiments were, but not evidence to show that he was a "renegade infidel."

Thus the court plunged recklessly and very incautiously into a sea of theological investigation. Mr. Sawyer wanted nothing better. He proceeded to deliver to the court, the reverend editors and witnesses, and the assembled company, such a lecture on theology as they seldom or never before had an opportunity of hearing. He used his privilege. He told them what he thought about Moses and the Pentateuch, about inspiration, &c., &c.; and threw, no doubt, considerable light into the minds of the critics and their witnesses. Mr. Le Grand Marvin, his counsel, wished him to have an opportunity of reading to the court a little Hebrew, Syriac, and Egyptian; but here the court backed out, and resolutely refused to hear a word of it. "Give us your opinions," said the judges, "but spare us your authorities."

Then came the defence, and said they would prove that Mr. Sawyer *was* an infidel, renegade, &c.; and called all sorts of D.D's., missionaries, and tract-society men, to prove it. Then they helped Mr. Sawyer by reading a quantity of passages from his book. Then they subsided.

But Mr. Marvin, full of zeal for his client, would not let the matter rest so. "You have read a part," said he. "That is not fair. A part taken from its context gives no just idea of the book. Let us read the whole: that is the only way." The patient judge, like Issachar between two burdens, assented; and so they began to read the book.

The rest of the case we give in the words of the reporter:—

The opposing counsel did not object, and the judge told him to proceed; and so he commenced with the preface, and table of contents, amid the laughter of the bar and other listeners. Mr. Marvin and Mr. Sawyer took turns, and continued the reading for about an hour. This was tedious, and all parties repented the turn things had taken. At length the judge ruled, that the entire contents of the book might be received in evidence without further reading; and the business ceased by mutual consent.

Mr. Foster summed up for the defence in a speech of an hour and a half, criticising the author and his work severely on evangelical grounds, in justification of the terms that had been applied to him by the plaintiff.

Mr. Marvin followed for the plaintiff in a plea somewhat longer, and went pretty deeply into the theological and philological merits of the questions that had been raised, and Mr. Sawyer's book. His veneration for received authorities and evangelical doctrines was manifestly small; and it was also apparent, that he had a profound regard for his client and his client's opinions. Mr. Sawyer must have selected his counsel with reference to his religious views as well as his legal ability.

The case was ready for the judge's charge about half-past nine o'clock in the evening. He distinguished between actions for libel and slander. Slander was oral: libel was written slander. To hold a person up in writing to unjust ridicule and suspicion was libellous. It had appeared from the evidence, that Mr. Sawyer was formerly a Congregational clergyman, and had withdrawn from the Oneida Congregational Association on account of peculiar theological views, and established himself as an independent Congregationalist. He did not now belong to any Orthodox denomination. He had written several works; among them the work which had occasioned the alleged libellous article. The law allows fair editorial criticism; and sometimes men are very lenient, and allow the critics wide latitude of expression: yet one has no right to hold another up to unjust ridicule. No attempt was made to blacken the plaintiff's character, — the defence had not assailed his moral character; and, as far as the article in question refers to his moral character, it does not

seem to be fully justifiable, unless the fact that his views are not in accordance with received tenets reflects upon his character. The word "infidel" has no technical or legal signification in this country: in England it had, because England had an established church. The simple fact of calling the plaintiff an infidel is not libel. If there is a libel, it consists in holding the plaintiff up to unjust and malicious ridicule or opprobrium; yet, in this respect, editors should have some latitude. In a case like this, the opprobrious terms should be deducible from the character of the work noticed; and it was for the jury to say whether they were or not. Those who criticise an author should not abuse him unnecessarily. The amount of damages in the case is left wholly to the discretion of the jury, and will depend upon the motives which they attribute to the defendant. If the article in question was libellous, it was rather in calling the plaintiff a "renegade" and a "lunatic" than in calling him an "infidel" and his book "twaddle."

The jury, it seems, did not agree; and a new trial was ordered. When it comes off, we hope to hear about it.

We are glad that Mr. Sawyer has taken this question into court. It is time to know whether "religious" editors are, or are not, to be held to the same responsibility as other editors. Let them abuse and criticise books as they please and can, say we; but we do not believe they have any right to apply disgraceful and injurious epithets to men. To call a clergyman, who professes to be a Christian, an infidel, is to injure him in his society and his work. No man, who claims to be a Christian, ought to be called an infidel or Deist; and, if there is not conscience enough among Christian editors to enable them to see this, we hope the courts will hold them to it. We do not speak on our own account, for we believe our epidermis is pretty tough; but we think it only just to others that this rule should be enforced.

UNITARIAN AND EPISCOPALIAN TENDENCIES IN GREAT BRITAIN.

One object, apparently, of the "Church Monthly," edited by Rev. F. D. Huntington and Rev. G. M. Randall, is to gather a few of the timid and ignorant Unitarians into the Episcopal fold by making them believe that they will be safer there from heresy, infidelity, and deism. Accordingly, we find a short article in the October number of this periodical, called "Unitarian Tendencies in Great Britain." The purpose of the article is to show that there is "a steady drift of opinions," "on both sides of the Atlantic," toward some great heresy. The article asserts that "the early Unitarians — Buckminster, Worcester, Channing, Whitman, the Wares, Greenwood, Thacher, and Norton — would have revolted at the notions which are now broached in Unitarian journals, pulpits, and annual conventions." "Erroneous and one-sided," the writer continues, "in their doctrinal interpretations, they yet never thought of forsaking the authority of the Bible, discrediting the sacraments, or denying the Christian miracles. Grief and alarm would have filled their souls, had they foreseen the rationalistic results of their movement in the present utter rejection of the supernatural and sacramental elements of our religion, the contempt of biblical inspiration, and the indiscriminate fellowship with all forms and shades of neology that are willing to come under the Unitarian title, on the part of many of the younger clergy. Representatives of the former devout generation still remain, like Dr. Montgomery in Great Britain, and Dr. Gannett, Dr. Peabody, and a few others, here; but they only maintain a melancholy and ineffectual struggle against

the increasing influence of a different class, who practically put the ideas of individual liberty and independence in place of the Apostles' Creed, modern literature in place of the Bible, and experiments of moral reform in place of the cross of Christ and his spiritual redemption."

Now, in reading all this glib talk about Unitarian "neology," one would really suppose that the writer had never heard of the missionary bishop of his own English Church, — Bishop COLENSO. Certainly, Bishop COLENSO is as near to American Episcopalians as English Unitarians are to us. What sort of *tendency* in the Church of England is shown by the bishop's book? Does this book, with the "Essays and Reviews," and the works of Jowett and Stanley, show any tendency toward "neology" and "rationalism," or do they not? Does the denial of the truth of the Book of Genesis, by a Church-of-England bishop, seem like "forsaking the authority of the Bible," &c., or no? Are there any "rationalistic results" attained in the "Essays and Reviews"? we should like to inquire.

The truth is, that the "tendency" in the Unitarian Church is now toward faith, and that in the Episcopal Church toward doubt, denial, and the most negative criticism. We have passed this negative period: they are approaching it. The spirit of the Unitarian body is toward a profound apprehension of the substantial truths of Orthodoxy, while it rejects the erroneous forms. But every church of the past is, to use the countryman's metaphor, "like a young bear with all its troubles before it." The difference between the Church of Freedom and the Church of Creeds is like the difference between a republic and a monarchy, so well pointed out in the happy illustration of Fisher Ames. "In a republic," said he, "we are like people on a raft, — our feet are wet all the time; but we cannot sink. A monarchy, on the other hand, is like

a vessel, — very comfortable as long as you do not strike a rock; but then you go to the bottom."

Churches which trust to the Protestant principle of private judgment are always exposed to novelty and innovation; but thus they learn not to be afraid of error: they become sure of the truth they hold, and are able to give a reason for the faith that is in them. But churches which lean on the authority of creeds or bishops are liable to be shaken to pieces by any whiff of novelty. We infinitely prefer our own condition to that of the Episcopal Church. We, at any rate, have no bishops who attack the Bible, and no bishops who defend slavery out of the Bible.

It may be a delightful thing to have a bishop to reign over you, so long as you are able to imagine him to be a very holy man, and very much wiser than other men; but when a church is under the charge of such bishops as the two Onderdonks of New York and Pennsylvania, Bishop Doane of New Jersey, or Bishop Hopkins of Vermont, it may be doubtful if the benefit of bishops is sufficient to compensate for the scandal. A writer in the "Boston Transcript" (SIGMA), himself an Episcopalian, referred recently to the disgraceful quarrels in Boston between Messrs. Doane and Hopkins, before it was thought best to raise them to the episcopate. And now Bishop Hopkins devotes himself to defending American slavery from the Bible; and his writings are used as Copperhead electioneering documents, to such an extent as to compel a brother-bishop to issue a formal protest against them.

Considering all these things, the "Church Monthly" will perhaps permit us to ask, What is the present tendency of things in the Episcopal Church in England and America?

NEW WORK ON JOHN HUSS.*

Mr. Gillett has written a history of John Huss, in two octavo volumes. It is published by Gould & Lincoln, of this city. It is an important contribution, not only to civil history, but also to the history of the Church.

Among the "Reformers before the Reformation," John Huss takes his place with Wickliffe and Savonarola. Coming a little after the first (who preached from 1360 to 1384), Huss was born in 1373, — eleven years before Wickliffe's death; and was burned in 1415, — thirty-seven years before the birth of Savonarola.

Wickliffe had taught that the power of the pope came from the emperor; that appeals should lie from the ecclesiastical to the royal courts; that the commission of mortal sins vacated the power of the priest; that tithes ought not to be paid to wicked priests; that the Church could do nothing against the Scripture; and that Christ was only spiritually present in the Eucharist. Huss was a student of Wickliffe, and preached, like him, against the vices of the clergy, and taught that the papacy was a useless institution; that all Christian ministers were equal; that monastic institutions should be abolished; and that princes had the right to take possession of church-property, when it was used improperly. Such teaching as this brought on him the charge of heresy; and the result we know.

Many of our readers may have seen the noble painting by Lessing, in the Dusseldorf Gallery, representing Huss at the stake, and the poor bigoted old woman bringing the

---

* The Life and Times of John Huss; or, The Bohemian Reformation of the Fifteenth Century. By E. H. Gillett. In two vols. Boston: Gould & Lincoln, 59, Washington Street. 1863.

log of wood to add to the fire, occasioning his memorable phrase, "*O sancta simplicitas!*" This splendid historic painting only does justice to the character and worth of Huss. We are glad that Mr. Gillett has added another picture of his life in this valuable and learned history, which we recommend to our readers as being the only work in which they can find all that they may wish to know about Bohemia, the Hussites, the Taborites, the wars of religion, and the Council of Constance. These volumes fill a historic chasm which has long been left vacant. The author seems to have displayed much ardor and fidelity in the most industrious researches. He has not written his history and biography by making up a new book out of old ones; he has conscientiously consulted original sources: and so he gives us the means of judging for ourselves of the value of his labors, and of the disputed points of history.

CATHOLICITY OF THE NEW CHURCH, AND UNCATHOLICITY OF NEWCHURCHMEN. By B. F. Barrett. New York: Mason Brothers. Boston: Mason & Hamlin. 1863.

This book of our excellent brother Barrett, and some recent articles in Dr. O. A. Brownson's Review, indicate the good which the Unitarians sometimes do by sending their *élèves* into other religious societies. A man brought up under the influence of Dr. Channing, or that of Henry Ware, jun., may turn Roman Catholic, Swedenborgian, or Calvinist; but, in either case, he will carry a certain Unitarian leaven into his new connection. It may not be much; but a little is enough. Thus this book of Mr. Barrett is the cropping-out of the original Catholicity of his ante-Swedenborgian opinions. It is his business to

liberalize the New-Church people, and to show them the genuine liberality of their founder. He, as a Unitarian by birth and breeding, is able to see the liberal side of Swedenborg, which is hidden from the eyes of those who come to Swedenborgianism from the narrower sects. Just so is Dr. Brownson helping mightily to Catholicize the Catholics. His fiery and very vital leaven has given considerable activity to that somewhat heavy lump. He has set the Catholics thinking; and, when people begin to think, there is no knowing what may happen.

Our friend Mr. Barrett has had a rather hard fate among his brethren of the New Jerusalem. Indeed, the New Jerusalem appears to partake of some of the characteristics of the Old Jerusalem, especially in its dislike to reformers, and its disposition to stone the prophets of the present, while it builds tombs to the martyrs of the past.

Mr. Barrett is a very earnest and sincere believer in the revelations of Swedenborg. He has devoted his time and energy for many years in advocating and promulgating the doctrines of that great and wise man. But those who believe in these doctrines are of two sorts, — the sectarian and the unsectarian Swedenborgians. The first class think that all of Swedenborgian truth is in their church: the latter believe that there is much outside of it. The former fall into the old-fashioned way of thinking that all must be damned who do not follow with them: the others are satisfied if men will follow after the truth. It is unnecessary to say that Mr. Barrett arranges himself with the latter class of Swedenborgians.

Swedenborg himself did not propose to found a separate sect. *His* New Jerusalem was not a visible organization, but an invisible spirit of truth falling from the skies into good and honest hearts in all churches. He remained to his death, if we remember right, a member of the Lutheran Church of his native country. Before his

death, he took the sacrament from a minister of the Swedish Church; he himself conducting a part of the service, and the minister consecrating the elements.

In the book before us, Mr. Barrett earnestly advocates this liberal view of Swedenborgianism, and conclusively shows that it was the view held by Swedenborg himself. In the well-known conversation between Dr. Johnson and Wilkes, in which the doctor rebuked the other for certain supposed opinions and actions, Wilkes replied, "But, my good sir, please to remember that I was never a Wilkesite." Just so, Swedenborg was never a Swedenborgian.

SECTARIAN SCURRILITY.

How does the Liberal Christian public like the idea of being openly denounced as "a piratical crew;" claiming the Christian name, yet denying the divinity of Christ,—calling him a mere creature like themselves; and, with a great show of "politeness," leading souls downward to ruin? Such were the expressions used at a recent Baptist association in this place, in the opening or occasional discourse; and the language was aggravated by the fact, that the declaration was made in a community where the Liberals have done decidedly the larger part in building the churches and sustaining the preachers of the Trinitarian sects. Instead of erecting, as they might have done, a suitable and noble temple of worship, adapted to all the religious and reformatory purposes of the public, the more liberal classes among us have fairly turned to and done the major part,—*first* in building a Baptist meeting-house; then extensively repairing it; and, after that, aiding quite as largely in the erection and finish of a Methodist structure;

and, in like manner, helping both ministers to a salary, without which copious contributions neither of the clergymen could have been sustained. And, for all this, there remains for these beneficent neighbors the admirable appreciation indicated in the above balderdash from a leading discourse; while the Liberals have not a place, in our village, for sermon or lecture, which they can call their own, or even occupy without the permission, actual or implied, of the parties whom they have so essentially aided.

Such, however, is the necessary sequence to the continued upbuilding of those old and terrible errors which for so many centuries have flooded the world with persecution and wrath, and which, under the pretence of salvation, *boldly* claim to *insure* a perpetual experience of wretchedness and woe to myriads of suffering humanity.

In view of these facts, and of numerous other circumcumstances associated with individual and popular experience, Liberal Christians have certainly intelligence enough to determine *which* party is most truly entitled to the appellation of "piratical crew;" and, from many considerations, it is manifest, that, whatever "politeness" Unitarians and others of kindred ideas may have, their opposers have courtesy quite as much for a cover to dogmatic slurs, and the betrayal of every thing truly broad and evangelical, as for any more legitimate purpose.

But, as I do not intend to enlarge on these copious topics in the limited space of the "Monthly Journal," I will now close by reiterating the question, "How do the Liberal readers of these liberal pages like the idea of being denounced as a 'piratical crew' by the parties whom they have so very liberally helped?"

It strikes me that there are vital and beneficent measures now on hand, to which the liberal public can render aid, without the necessity of forwarding still farther the deadly dogmas of the dark ages; and I trust that the Lib-

eral cause will henceforth look more fully to its unfolding than it has done, and so assume its true station in fully advancing itself and the people to the shining platform of VITAL CHRISTIANITY.

ATHOL DEPOT, MASS.,
Sept. 29, 1863.

MEETINGS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

Nov. 9, 1863. — Present, Messrs. Stebbins, Hedge, Newell, Barrett, Hinckley, Winkley, Ware, Sawyer, Smith, and Fox.

The Committee on Western Correspondence reported in favor of granting to the society in Austinburg, Ohio, in response to their application, the sum of $100; which report was adopted.

The Special Committee on Pulpit Supplies presented a report, accompanied by the following circulars. The report was accepted; and it was voted that the circulars should be printed, and sent to the parties for whom they were designed.

"TO COMMITTEES FOR THE SUPPLY OF PULPITS IN VACANT PARISHES.

"Complaints from many quarters have for some time been made, both in public and private, with regard to the present manner of supplying the vacant pulpits of the denomination. An inquiry by a Committee of this Board has satisfied them that something must be done to prevent the scandal attaching to the present system; while, a general consent pointing to the Executive Committee as the proper source of remedy, they have determined to undertake it.

"They can, however, do nothing effective without the hearty co-operation of the parishes.

"At present, the only recognized way in which a parish and a candidate can come together is by the employment of a middle man, whose charge of *ten per cent* upon the sum received by the candidate acts as a direct and onerous tax upon his somewhat limited wage; while other evils growing out of such an arrangement need not be enumerated: they are serious, and should be removed.

"The plan proposed by the Committee is this: —

"*First*, That there shall be kept by the Secretary of the Association a list of those gentlemen who are seeking a settlement, always open to the inspection of Parish Committees. This list, corrected every week, shall contain the names, the present engagement, the address, of every candidate.

"*Second*, Committees are requested, so far as possible, to call and examine this list, and make their own selection. Where this cannot be done, they are asked to apply to the Secretary, who will furnish them with a list, from which they may themselves select, he supplying their immediate demand to the best of his ability.

"*Third*, The object of the Association being, in part, to make parishes feel a more immediate interest and responsibility in filling their own vacancies, they desire it to be understood, that the duty they assume is one rather of reference than of recommendation; that the Secretary is to give all desired information, but is not expected to pass upon the adaptation of this or that person to this or that place.

"*Fourth*, It is, moreover, respectfully suggested to parishes, that a much more speedy and satisfactory way of filling a vacancy in the pulpit would be to call in the counsel and advice of some neighboring clergyman, cognizant of their position, character, and wants; and trust to his suggestions, rather than throw themselves upon any distant agent, who can know little or nothing about them.

"To help them in their effort to furnish an adequate and legitimate communication between candidates and parishes, the Executive Committee would ask, —

"*First*, The withdrawal of your countenance from all now recognized agencies.

"*Second*, An application to the Secretary in their stead."

"TO CANDIDATES FOR SETTLEMENT IN THE MINISTRY.

"The Executive Committee of the American Unitarian Association ask the hearty co-operation of candidates for the ministry to their effort to furnish adequate and legitimate communication between them and the vacant parishes. To this end, a list shall be kept open at the Secretary's desk; where each candidate is requested not only to place his name, but his present engagement, the time of its termination, with his address, to be corrected whenever he shall desire.

"The Secretary is directed, that, so far as is possible, candidates for settlement shall have the supply of parishes seeking a pastor.

"The Committee believe it impossible to devise a system which shall not be open to objections. They have assumed a delicate and difficult duty, because they seemed the only ones to assume it. They have sought advice of those most nearly interested. They do not expect to meet all the demands that may be made, or to prevent the fault-finding of the disappointed, the unreasonable, the ambitious, or the jealous; but will do all that lies in their power to forward every honest and hearty worker. They would ask your confidence in the integrity of their purpose, and trust that the present endeavor may lead to, if it do not itself effect, that change so imperative in this branch of the work of the Church."

Permission was given to the Committee on Publications to distribute gratuitously, in such ways as might seem to them best, the tracts of the first series now on hand, and also "Selections from the Writings of William E. Channing, D.D.," and other publications of the Association.

The Committee on Army Missions reported, that Mr. Scandlin, on account of sickness in his family, had been compelled, very reluctantly, to decline a re-appointment as Army Missionary of the Association.

It was then unanimously voted, "That the Committee have full power to employ a missionary to take the place of Mr. Scandlin in the field; and also to employ such

other agents in camps and hospitals, for the distribution of tracts and for Christian ministrations, as, in their judgment, shall seem advisable."

A letter was read from Daniel Denny, Esq., declining to accept the office of Vice-President, to which he was elected at the last meeting, on account of engagements which would prevent his regular attendance at the monthly meetings.

Henry P. Kidder, Esq., of Boston, was then unanimously elected a Vice-President to fill this vacancy.

After the transaction of other business, the Board adjourned to Monday, Dec. 14.

INTELLIGENCE.

The Board of Management of the Sunday-School Society have chosen Mr. Moses T. Rice, of Boston (a member of the Board), Secretary, in place of Rev. S. A. Smith, who was elected at the annual meeting, but declined to serve; and have chosen Rev. William P. Tilden a director in place of Mr. Rice.

The Annual Meeting of the North Middlesex Sunday-School Society was held at Nashua, N. H., on Wednesday, Oct. 28; when the following officers were elected for the coming year: President, Rev. Frederic Hinckley of Lowell; Secretary, Rev. George M. Rice of Westford.

Rev. Loammi G. Ware was installed as pastor of the society in Burlington, Vt., on Wednesday, Nov. 4. The order of services was as follows: Introductory anthem; prayer; reading from the Scriptures; hymn; sermon, by Rev. Cyrus A. Bartol, D.D., of Boston; anthem; prayer, by Rev. John Cordner of Montreal; hymn; charge, by Rev. Edward E. Hale of Boston; address to the people, by Rev. John F. W. Ware of Cambridgeport; prayer; doxology; benediction, by the pastor.

Mr. WILLIAM BROWN, a graduate of the Cambridge Divinity School in the class of the present year, was ordained as pastor of the society in Sherborn, Mass., on Thursday, Nov. 5. The order of services was as follows: Voluntary, by the choir; introductory prayer, by Rev. John M. Merrick of Walpole; selections from the Scriptures, by Rev. Benjamin H. Bailey of Dedham; hymn; sermon, by Rev. James Freeman Clarke of Boston; ordaining prayer, by Rev. George R. Noyes, D.D., of Cambridge; hymn; charge, by Rev. Henry F. Harrington of Cambridgeport; right hand of fellowship, by Rev. Edward I. Galvin of Brookfield; address to the people, by Rev. Theodore H. Dorr, the former pastor; concluding prayer, by Rev. Horatio Alger of South Natick; doxology; benediction, by the pastor.

Rev. JOHN C. PARSONS has resigned the charge of the society in Waltham, Mass.

Rev. HENRY C. BADGER of East Cambridge has accepted an invitation to take charge of the society in New Bedford, Mass., for one year.

Rev. CHARLES W. BUCK, a graduate of the Meadville Theological School in the last class, has accepted a call from the society in Fall River, Mass.

Rev. JOSEPH F. LOVERING has resigned the charge of the Second Society in Portland, Me., to accept the chaplaincy of the Seventeenth Regiment Maine Volunteers.

Rev. CHARLES B. WEBSTER has resigned the charge of the society at Neponset, Mass.; having received a lieutenant's commission in the corps d'Afrique, now forming in Louisiana, under Gen. Andrews.

Rev. SYLVAN S. HUNTING has received a new commission, reinstating him as chaplain of the Twenty-seventh Michigan Regiment.

Rev. ALPHEUS S. NICKERSON, formerly of Chelsea, has taken charge of the society in Barnstable, Mass., for six months, ending the 1st of March next.

Rev. EDMUND B. WILLSON, of the North Society, Salem, has been appointed chaplain of the Twenty-fourth Massachusetts Regiment.

Rev. JAMES THURSTON was installed as pastor of the society in Leicester, Mass., on Tuesday, Nov. 17.

Rev. A. G. HIBBARD, for two years past pastor of the Universalist Society in Aurora, Ill., has accepted a call from the Unitarian Society in Detroit, Mich.

Rev. RUFUS P. STEBBINS, D.D., has resigned the charge of the society in Woburn, Mass.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Since our last Notice.

Ritter's Geographical Studies: Geographical Studies, by the late Prof. CARL RITTER, of Berlin. Translated from the original German, by WILLIAM LEONHARD GAGE, translator and editor of Prof. Heinrich Steffens's "Story of my Career," &c. Boston: Gould & Lincoln, 59, Washington Street. 1863.

Mr. Gage, the translator of these Essays on Physical Geography, studied at Berlin under the direction of Prof. Ritter, and there became well acquainted with him. The labor of translating these papers could not have fallen into better hands. We have again to thank the enterprising firm of GOULD & LINCOLN for presenting us with this volume, which is indispensable to every man of science, and every library which undertakes to keep abreast with the geographical knowledge of the time.

Mr. Gage gives the following account of Ritter in his personal appearance and as a lecturer: —

"When I was in Berlin, five years ago, Ritter's room was still full: more than three hundred young men were hearing his lectures. He knew his art well. With almost womanly tact, he seized upon those features which present circumstances made interesting, and culled out of the immense masses of matter lying in his mind just what he could use with the greatest profit. He illustrated freely by excellent maps; and was a master in the use of the blackboard, sketching gracefully and readily whatever made his subject clear. I shall not forget the patriarchal appearance of Carl Ritter in the lecture-room in 1855. He used his notes about half the time, but read them easily and with great distinctness. Obscure and involved almost without paral-

lel in his written dissertations, yet his style was simple in the lecture-room; and his clear articulation and well-chosen emphasis, combined in a highly musical voice, made it easy to follow him. He was a tall, finely proportioned man, with a noble head, a most sincere and earnest manner, yet unusually quiet and simple. His dress was peculiar when an old man; and no one who frequented the famous Linden Avenue of Berlin would fail to remark that tall and venerable figure, clad in a long blue coat and broad-rimmed hat, both half a century out of date. He used to wear a large rolling collar, like that worn by a past generation of New-England grandfathers; and that, together with the huge horn spectacles, gave him a rusticity of appearance, and a simple friendliness, which captivated every one who knew his learning, his talents, and his heart. It was a characteristic of Ritter, that the external man was so penetrated by his inner nature, that the two were inseparable and indistinguishable. He was such a one, that, if you had looked upon his face, you had read the whole man; and therefore he belonged to that class of minds which always makes the same impression upon men of all conditions and mental varieties."

Vassar Female College. Report on Organization. (Pamphlet, pp. 53.)

Loyal Publication Society. No. 22. Emancipation is Peace, by ROBERT DALE OWEN.

Resistance to Evil: a Discourse delivered to the Barton-square Society in Salem, Sept. 6. By WILLIAM H. KNAPP. Boston: John Wilson & Son.

This is a capital sermon, from which we should like to make a few extracts, and hope to do so. But, lest we should not find room for them, we would advise our readers to get it, and read the whole. It discusses the question, *Ought we to worship the Devil, or to resist him?*

Address at the Funeral of Rev. GEORGE G. INGERSOLL, D.D. Delivered in Keene, N.H., Sept. 18, by WILLIAM ORNE WHITE. Boston: John Wilson & Son.

An excellent sermon on an excellent man.

A Discourse commemorative of the late Rev. ROBERT BAIRD, D.D. By WILLIAM B. SPRAGUE, D.D., Minister of the Second Presbyterian Congregation, Albany. Albany: 1863.

The Headship of Christ, and the Rights of the Christian People: a Collection of Essays, Historical and Descriptive Sketches, and Personal Portraitures; with the author's celebrated Letter to Lord Brougham. By HUGH MILLER. Edited, with a Preface, by PETER BAYNE. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1863.

Messrs. Gould & Lincoln have given us, in this volume of 500 pages, a collection of Hugh Miller's papers concerning the celebrated controversy between the Kirk of Scotland and the Free Church. The book contains the *pièces justicatifs* of that great struggle, and is an important contribution to ecclesiastical history, as well as interesting to the admirers of Hugh Miller.

The Sanitary-Commission Bulletin. Vol. I., No. 1. New York: Nov. 1, 1863.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

1863.			
Nov. 2.	From Society in Grafton, for Monthly Journals . .		$11.00
4.	„ Rev. Fred. Hinckley's Society, Lowell, as a donation	$61.00	
	For Monthly Journals	14.00	
			75.00
8.	„ Society in Groton, for Monthly Journals . .		50.00
11.	„ „ „ Ashby, as a donation		21.65
13.	„ Rev. F. A. Farley, D.D., Trustee, as income of Graham Fund		274.81
13.	„ Society in Fall River, for Monthly Journals .		13.00
27.	„ „ „ Bernardston, as a donation . . .		14.00
27.	„ „ „ Montague, as a donation		8.00

ARMY FUND.

Oct. 25.	From a friend	$2.00
26.	„ „ „	25.00
Nov. 2.	„ „ „ through Rev. J. F. W. Ware . . .	10.00
2.	„ Rev. J. F. W. Ware's Society, Cambridgeport, additional (in all, $134.62)	3.00
2.	„ a friend	2.00
5.	„ Mrs. Steele	4.00
11.	„ Charles Vaughan, Esq..	5.00
11.	„ a friend	5.00
17.	„ „ „ through Rev. J. F. W. Ware . . .	10.00